



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VII. — *The Deme Kolonos.*

BY DR. F. O. BATES,

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

IN my work entitled *The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes*, I took the position that with the exception of divided demes, as Agryle, Lamptraï, etc., which were composed of two parts, an upper and a lower, and of different demes of the same name, as Halai, Oinoë, etc., none belonged to more than one tribe at the same time. Kirchner had earlier defended the view that a deme might belong to more than one tribe simultaneously, and this view had gained acceptance with some scholars of note. To determine the truth in this matter it was necessary that each example which seemed to support his assumption should be examined carefully and the degree of reliability of the evidence determined. With this purpose in mind I set out to study each of the instances separately, and this study would have formed the subject of the present paper if the investigation had been completed in time, and had not of necessity been of such a statistical nature.

The present paper, then, will be a discussion of the deme Kolonos, a part of the longer investigation.

Prior to the creation of Ptolemais a deme of this name is found belonging to Aigeis, Leontis, and Antiochis, and subsequently to Aigeis, Leontis, and Ptolemais. Furthermore, the demotikon, *i.e.* the name which indicates a citizen's civil residence, appears as ἐκ Κολωνοῦ, Κολωνῆθεν, and Κολωνῆς (-εῖς). The question is, then, how are these facts to be interpreted? And on this point there is considerable difference of opinion.

Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*, I., p. 355, writing in 1874, when the material was less abundant than now, expressed the belief that there was only one deme of this name, which belonged to Antiochis in the time of ten

tribes, to Aigeis in the time of twelve, and which changed its tribal connection again in later times.

Dittenberger, *Hermes*, IX. (1875), p. 403 ff., shows the impossibility of this view by pointing out that Kolonos belonged both to Aigeis and Antiochis in the time of ten tribes, to Aigeis in the time of Antigonis and Demetrias, to Aigeis and Ptolemais in the second century B.C., and to Leontis and Ptolemais in Roman times. Such a change in the tribal connection of a deme as his words imply presupposes that, when a new tribe was created, a general redistribution of the demes took place. This we now know was not the case, and that the introduction of a new tribe affected the membership of those demes only which were transferred to the new tribe.

Wachsmuth later, *ibid.* 2, 1 (1890), p. 233 ff., abandons his former position and admits that there were probably two demes, one Kolonos, the other Kolone, analogous to Oion and Oie (Oe), the former having the demotikon ἐκ Κολωνοῦ, the latter Κολωνήθεν. The deme that appears under Leontis with the demotikon Κολωνῆς (-εῖς) he thinks is a part of the Kolonos which belonged to Aigeis. He further states that Kolonos did not remain under Aigeis in imperial times.

The points which will be discussed in this paper are :

1. What distinction exists in the use of the demotika, ἐκ Κολωνοῦ, Κολωνήθεν, and Κολωνῆς (-εῖς), and how many Kolonos-demes were there ?

2. Did Aigeis retain its Kolonos in imperial times ?

To take up the questions in the order given we find first that there are thirteen references in the inscriptions of *C.I.A.* where the deme belonged to Aigeis :

<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 643	400/399 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 660	390/89 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 870	middle of fourth century B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 872	341/0 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> IV. 2, 1025 <i>b</i>	before 307/6 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 1023	ca. end of fourth century B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 324	275/4 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 338	273/2 B.C.

<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 329	272/1 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 859	237/6 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 471	123/2 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 469	107/6 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 465	105/4 B.C.

Of these thirteen references eleven, according to the *C.I.A.*, have ἐκ Κολωνοῦ for the demotikon, and two Κολωνῆθεν. What first attracts our attention is that in both these latter the form is due to a restoration. The references are *C.I.A.* II. 1023 and 643. The first inscription contains a fragmentary list of Athenian citizens set up for some purpose not now known, and arranged under their respective demes. In l. 31 there remains -ῆθεν, the ending clearly of some demotikon. In l. 44 there is left -λωνῆθεν, which can stand for Κολωνῆθεν only, and Koehler rightly restores this. In l. 31 the same author restores Ἀγκυλῆθεν, thus making the list one of citizens of Aigeis, but he confesses that this reading is by no means certain. It is based on his own identification of the men mentioned in l. 37 as: -σίας Μελησίππου with Μελησίππος Μελησίου of *C.I.A.* II. 872, l. 29, one of the prytanes of Ankyle. Rangabé, *Antiquités Helléniques*, No. 2349, reads in l. 31 Κεφαλῆθεν, thus regarding the inscription as a list of citizens of Leontis, and furthermore he restores Σωσίας in l. 37.

But it can be practically demonstrated that neither of these readings is correct. Noting the number of letters to the left of a vertical line drawn through the η of -ῆθεν, l. 31, we find that in the six cases where a full restoration is possible and certain, four (ll. 36, 41, 42, and 45) have seven letters to the left of the vertical, and two (ll. 40 and 44) have six. To read either Ἀγκυλῆθεν or Κεφαλῆθεν in l. 37 requires a restoration of only five letters, whereas we should have six or seven. Inasmuch as Κολωνῆθεν in l. 44 is certain, we must look for a deme in l. 31 which belonged to the same tribe as Kolone. Since Kolone belonged to both Leontis and Antiochis we naturally look among the demes of those tribes and find that Ἀλωπεκῆθεν, the demotikon of Alopeke of Antiochis, is best

suited to the place, for to read this necessitates a restoration of six letters.

Nor is this merely a mechanical process, as it might seem. There is other evidence which strongly confirms this reading. In the list there were twelve persons belonging to the deme of l. 31, or, counting fathers' names, twenty-four names. Of these twenty-four Koehler writes sixteen, most of which are preserved entire in the inscription or are quite certain restorations. Of these sixteen names, two, Leostratos, l. 38, and Diophanes, l. 42, are the names of demesmen of Alopeke found in *C.I.A.* II. 803 d, l. 127, the date of which is 360/59 B.C., and in *C.I.A.* II. 316, l. 60, the date of which is 283/2 B.C. Our inscription was set up about the end of the fourth century B.C. Moreover, l. 38 shows *-όφιλος Λεωστράτου*. Koehler does not restore this, though *Δημόφιλος Λεωστράτου*, the restoration of Rangabé, is obvious and thoroughly in keeping with the space to be filled out. Now in *C.I.A.* II. 803 d, l. 127, we learn that Leostratos of Alopeke was superintendent of the dockyards in 360/59 B.C., and that not long after this Demophilos of the same deme paid 101 drachmas for Leostratos. From other instances of a similar procedure noted in the same inscription and commented on by Boeckh in his work entitled *Urkunden über das attische Seewesen*, the most obvious interpretation of this is that Demophilos was the son and heir of Leostratos, and on the death of his father redeemed an unpaid obligation of his. This being the case, we may reasonably identify them with Demophilos and Leostratos (son and father) of *C.I.A.* II. 1023, l. 38.

Again, in lists of citizens of Aigeis the number from Ankyle is relatively small, while in lists of citizens of Antiochis the number from Alopeke is relatively large. As a matter of fact Ankyle was a small deme of Aigeis, whereas Alopeke was one of the largest, if not the largest, of Antiochis. This proportion agrees with the restoration I am contending for in *C.I.A.* II. 1023, for here we find twelve citizens from the deme of l. 31, which I restore as Alopeke, three from the deme of l. 27, one from that of l. 25, and four from that of l. 20. If we should read Ankyle in l. 31, the number

of citizens from that deme (twelve) would be out of all proportion to the relative size of the deme.

Furthermore, of the names in the earlier part of the inscription, Olympiodoros, l. 23, and Antiphanes, l. 24, are found to be the names of citizens of Anaphlystos, another deme of Antiochis, the first in *C.I.A.* II. 1858, 1871, 1872, 1874, and 1877, the second in *C.I.A.* II. 794 b, l. 59, and Philinos, l. 7, was the name of a member of Antiochis, as seen by *C.I.A.* II. 444, l. 89. So Nikokles, l. 9, is found in *C.I.A.* II. 983, l. 1. 61 to be the name of a demesman of Semachidai, another deme of Antiochis.

These considerations make it more than probable that in l. 31 we should restore *Ἀλωπεκῆθεν*, thus making the list one of citizens of Antiochis and not of Aigeis or Leontis.

The second reference under Aigeis in which the demotikon is *Κολωνῆθεν* is *C.I.A.* II. 643, 400/399 B.C. The inscription contains a list of the *ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῆς Ἀθηναίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν*. For the second member of the board, who, as shown by the official tribal order observed in arranging the names, is from Aigeis, there is left on the stone ΣΟΦΟ + 13 spaces (the inscription has the *stoichedon* arrangement). Koehler restores Σοφο[κλῆς Κολωνῆθεν]. But on the basis of *C.I.A.* II. 672, where is found Σοφοκλῆς Ἰοφώντος ἐκ Κολωνοῦ, and *C.I.A.* II. 1177, where we read Ἰοφῶν Σοφοκλέους ἐκ Κολωνοῦ, we may more plausibly restore here ἐκ Κολωνοῦ which has the same number of letters as *Κολωνῆθεν*. Since writing this I find that Fränkel in Boeckh's *Staats-haushaltung der Athener*, p. 272, footnote, takes the same position. It may be urged that at this period the genitive singular ending of *o*-stems was written not -ου but -ο. While this is generally true the objection is not fatal, for the writing -ου appears sporadically as early as 500 B.C. (see Meisterhans, *Gram. d. att. Inschrift.*, p. 21).

Admitting these alterations, we see that the deme of Aigeis had only ἐκ Κολωνοῦ for its demotikon, which points unmistakably to Κολωνός for the name of the deme.

There are eight references in which the deme is found under Leontis:

<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 864	fourth century B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 799 c.	369/8 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 991	ca. 200 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 470	119/8 B.C.
<i>B.C.H.</i> p. 147	118/7 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1076	22/3 A.D.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1091	85/6 A.D.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1128	164/5 A.D.

Of these all have **Κολωνῆθεν** when the demotikon is appended to the demesman's name; when placed at the head of a list of names, as in *C.I.A.* II. 864, and when used as the name of demesmen collectively, as in *C.I.A.* II. 991, the demotikon is in the nominative plural and has the form **Κολωνῆς** or **-εῖς** according to the period. Since stems in **-ο** would not yield **-ῆθεν**, but **-οθεν**, we must refer **Κολωνῆθεν** not to **Κολωνός**, but to **Κολώνη** or **Κολωναί**, and regard it as a deme entirely distinct from Kolonos.

Under Antiochis there are only two references:

<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 869	middle of the fourth century B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 944	ca. 325/4 B.C.

In both of these the form found is **Κολωνῆς** or **-εῖς** according to the date of the inscription. In both cases the name stands at the head of a list of names where the plural form is natural. **Κολωνῆς** (**-εῖς**) must be referred to a singular **Κολωνεύς**, instead of which the form in **-θεν** seems to have been preferred for this deme.

Coming next to the deme of this name belonging to Ptolemais, we find six references in which the tribe is indicated:

<i>C.I.A.</i> II. 471	123/2 B.C.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1093	103/4 A.D.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1120	150/1 A.D.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1128	164/5 A.D.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1138	174/5 A.D.
<i>C.I.A.</i> III. 1153	ca. 190 A.D.

In each instance the demotikon is *Κολωνῆθεν*. In my work on the five post-Kleisthenean tribes an attempt was made to show that this deme was the Kolone or Kolonai which formerly belonged to Antiochis. The basis for the belief lay in the fact that both Aigeis and Leontis retained their demes of this name after Ptolemais was created; Aigeis according to the positive evidence of inscriptions until 105/4 B.C. (and probably still later, as I shall attempt to show), and Leontis until 164/5 A.D., whereas there is no inscriptional evidence that Antiochis could claim such a deme after the close of the fourth century B.C.

From the facts presented it can be clearly seen that there were two deme names, *Κολωνός* and *Κολώνη* or *Κολωναί*, and probably three different demes belonging to as many different tribes — Aigeis, Leontis, and Antiochis prior to the creation of Ptolemais, and to Aigeis, Leontis, and Ptolemais subsequently. The existence, however, of three demes of this name cannot be positively proved at present, but seems not unnatural when we consider that many deme names derived from some topographical characteristic were duplicates (cf. Halai, Oinoe, Oion (2) and Oie and Oa, Phegaia (2) and Phegous, Potamos, Myrrhinous and Myrrhinoutta). Besides, this assumption explains the tribal relation satisfactorily, and I doubt whether this can be satisfactorily explained otherwise.

There still remains the question whether Aigeis retained its deme Kolonos in Roman times.

Wachsmuth says it did not, and in this he is followed by Dittenberger, for in the Indices to *C.I.A.* III. he does not recognize Kolonos among the demes of that tribe. In fact, *ἐκ Κολωνοῦ*, the demotikon of Kolonos exclusively, occurs only twice in imperial times, *C.I.A.* III. 1765 and 1766, and here its tribe is not indicated. Dittenberger puts both references under Kolone of Leontis, but why, does not appear. His reason for not putting them under Aigeis, I take it, is that no connection with Aigeis is shown, and Wachsmuth says Aigeis did not retain its Kolonos in imperial times. But should we adopt this principle of assigning demes we should be at a loss to determine the tribes of Ikaria, Otryne,

Plotheia, and Teithras (to Aigeis), of Pelekes (to Leontis), of Aigilia, Themakos, and Hyporeia (to Ptolemais), of Xypete (to Kekropis), of Anakaia, Thymaitadai, Auridai, Dekeleia, Keiriadai, and Sphendale (to Hippothontis), and of Atene (to Attalis), for in imperial times the tribes of these sixteen demes are nowhere indicated in inscriptions, and yet no one would venture to assign them to any other tribes than those to which they formerly belonged.

In view of this condition of affairs and the fact that the Kolonos of Aigeis has only the demotikon ἐκ Κολωνοῦ, while those of other tribes never have this form, we should unhesitatingly class these two references under Aigeis. Accordingly, Aigeis retained its Kolonos through all periods.